UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,277	07/08/2003	Haruyoshi Ono	030824	7735
38834 7590 09/27/2007 WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			EXAMINER	
			VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS	
SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2828	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	`		09/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		A					
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/614,277	ONO ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Tod T. Van Roy	2828				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 July 2007</u> .						
,	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
•	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>9-24</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>9-24</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachmer	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO 412)				
2) Notion Notion Notion Notion	ce of References Cited (PTO-692) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The examiner acknowledges the amending of claims 9, 14, 19 and 24.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9, 14, 19 and 24 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 9-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant's disclosed prior art (hereafter 'prior art').

With respect to claims 9 and 19, the prior art discloses a setting value generating device that generates such a setting value that causes laser light emitted from a laser module to have a predetermined wavelength (lambda target, spec. pg.4 line 17) and satisfies predetermined temperature conditions and predetermined power intensity conditions (fig.3a, defined temp / power ranges), the setting value generating device comprising: an optimum power intensity calculating unit (fig.1 #120) that calculates an optimum power intensity setting range (fig.3a) that maintains the predetermined wavelength falls within a predetermined power intensity variable range (range can be considered equal to the intensity setting range, fig.3a) a predetermined power intensity variable range (maintained via APC feedback); an optimum temperature calculating unit (fig.1 #120) that calculates an optimum temperature setting range (fig.3a, pgs.4-5 lines 37-9) that maintains the predetermined wavelength and falls within the predetermined

temperature variable range; and a setting value generating unit (fig.1 #120) that generates the setting value based on the optimum power intensity setting range (optimum is P_cent) calculated by the optimum power intensity calculating unit and the optimum temperature setting range calculated by the optimum temperature calculating unit (setting values generated based on temp/wavelength/power, pg.6 lines 17-21), wherein the laser module can be operated with the setting value that is located within the predetermined temperature setting range and the predetermined power intensity setting range even when the laser module does not have a center value of the predetermined power intensity variable range (As described at pg.2 lines 3-11 of the disclosure, the AAPA describes that the power value is controlled via an Automatic power control (APC), this control device is used to correct for minor deviations from a set value (P_cent), therefor, the module can have a value which is not the center value of the predetermined power intensity variable range, and the APC will adjust the driving current to return it to the P_cent value).

With respect to claims 10 and 20, the prior art discloses a relational expression defining unit (fig.1 #120) that defines a relational expression between a temperature and a power intensity that causes the laser module to maintain the predetermined wavelength (T_cal defined on pg.4, relating temperature, wavelength, and inherently relating the power intensity as the power intensity applied to the device influences both the temperature of the device itself, as well as the wavelength the device is outputting under the current conditions); a power intensity upper and lower limit defining unit (fig.1 #120, shown defined in fig.3a) that defines an upper limit value and a lower limit value

of a power intensity that satisfies the relational expression and also satisfies the predetermined temperature range and the predetermined power intensity range (P_High, P_Low); wherein the optimum power intensity calculating unit calculates the optimum power intensity that is the middle value between the upper limit value and the lower limit value of the power intensity defined by the power intensity upper and lower limit defining unit (see claim 1); and the optimum temperature calculating unit substitutes the optimum power intensity calculated by the optimum power intensity calculating unit in the relational expression defined by the relational expression defining unit (see claim 1, also, the P_cent value is set prior to the temp feedback loop, so the value would be used in the calculation as described in the rejection to claim 1, fig.2 S14).

With respect to claims 11 and 21, the prior art discloses the laser module can vary wavelengths (inherent, set target wavelength would not be necessary if only 1 wavelength were possible), and the setting value is generated in relation with each of the wavelengths (setting value generated with chosen target wavelength).

Claim s12 and 22 are rejected for the reasons outline in the rejections to claims 10 and 11. The prior art has disclosed the presence of multiple wavelengths being present in the transmitting device, each being stabilized when appropriately selected. It is inherent that there would be a shortest wavelength and a longest wavelength available, and that the relational expression unit, and power and temperature calculating unit (fig.1 #120) would control the shortest and longest wavelength conditions respectively.

With respect to claims 13 and 23, the prior art discloses a setting value storage unit that stores the setting value generated by the setting value generating unit, wherein the laser module contains unique identification information, and the setting value storage unit relates the setting value to the unique identification information and stores the setting value (pg.6 lines 17-24).

Claims 14-18 are rejected for the same reasons given in the rejection to claims 9-13, as they are the methods for calculating the setting value that has been disclosed in the prior art.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons given for the rejection to claims 9 and 19 above, as it is inherent that a recording medium of some type must be present for the computer functioning as the calculating unit to run the given program since the program itself must have been recorded to be read by the computer.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tod T. Van Roy whose telephone number is (571)272-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun Harvey can be reached on (571)272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVR

